



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/851,622	05/08/2001	Ejaz Ul Haq	44176.00033	4383

30256 7590 06/19/2002

SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY L.L.P
600 HANSEN WAY
PALO ALTO, CA 94304-1043

EXAMINER

LE, DINH THANH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2816

DATE MAILED: 06/19/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/851,622

Applicant(s)

HAQ, EJAZ UL

Examiner

DINH T. LE

Art Unit

2816

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____ 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 2816

NON-FINAL REEJECTION

Response to Applicant's Amendment

The rejection over Dumas (US Pat. 6,122,331) is withdrawn in view of the amendments to the claims.

The double patenting rejection over the Haq (US 6,255,859) is withdrawn in view of the arguments presented in the amendment.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the recitation "first controller coupled to the first comparator for coupling the first result to the output terminal based on the previous logical state" in claim 2, 11, 13-14, 19 and 20, "oscillating source" in claim 10 and "output circuitry" in claim 23 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 1-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Correction or clarification is required.

In claim 1, it is still not understood what the “known previous logical state” is, where it come from, how it can be related to the “oscillating signal” and the “incoming signal”, and how the signals can have the known previous state since this limitation is not clearly defined. Is the known previous logical state the predetermined state of the incoming signal? If this is true, how comparing two input signals can detect the transition of the incoming signal relative to “the known previous logical state” and what is meant by “to detect a transition in the incoming signal relative to the known previous logical state”. This description is misdescriptive. The same is true for claims 9, 11, 20 and 23.

In claim 2, it is unclear what the “output signal” is and where it comes from and how the recitation “generating a control signal based on the previous logical state “ is read on the preferred embodiment. Insofar as understood no such limitation can be determined on the drawings. The same is true for reciting “comparing the oscillating reference and the output signal” in claims 3-5.

In claim 23, the recitation “the comparator” on line 8 lacks clear antecedent basis. It is unclear what is meant by “circuitry for coupling to the output terminal of the comparator that is not coupled to the output terminal and . . . not transition” on lines 8-11.

In claims 29 and 32, it is unclear how a discontinuously varying signal can be an oscillating signal and how it is read on the preferred embodiment or the drawings.

The remaining claims are dependent from the above rejected claims and therefore also considered indefinite.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-33 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-10 of U.S. Patent No. 6,255,859. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both inventions disclose a circuit comprising:

- a first comparator.
- a second comparator
- a first controller and a second controller.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2816

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1 and 23 are rejected under 35 USC 102 (b) as being anticipated by Arends et al. (US Pat. 5,463,211).

Figures 2a and 3g disclose a detector circuit comprising an oscillating reference ©, incoming signal (B, C) and a comparator (5,6, 8) and a controller (7).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Dinh Le whose telephone number is (703) 305-3790. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 7:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tim Callahan, can be reached on (703) 308-4876. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 308-7725.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.



DINH LE
Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 2816

June 15, 2002